Chemical Data Quality Assessment

B.1 Introduction

A primary goal of the project was to produce a precise, accurate, representative and complete set of quantitative chemical data to prescribed minimum detection levels at the part per million level or below. There are numerous variables that may affect the quality and suitability of chemical data at this level of sensitivity, and a detailed Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) was developed to control these variables. Section 2.2 summarizes the design of the Sampling and Analysis Plan that guided the acquisition of data and established the Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) for use of the data to support decisions for this project. DQOs were established in the SAP for data precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness, comparability and sensitivity. This Appendix presents the results of a systematic check of the analysis results by Altech relative to the project specific DQOs.

B.2 Quality Control Roles and Responsibilities

The primary measures to control chemical data quality were implemented by the field sampling team and the laboratory analysts. A three tiered process was conducted to evaluate the data.

B.2.1 Laboratory Analysts

The first tier was by the laboratory analysts for each particular method used, performed at the time of analyses. Each analyst completed and documented the results of:

- Sample custody, labeling-sample login and condition of each sample upon receipt at the lab; extraction and analysis methods;
- Initial and continuing instrument calibration results;
- Spiking of samples with surrogate compounds and matrix and matrix duplicate samples with target compounds;
- Primary field sample analyses and measurement of spike recoveries; and
- Electronic and hard copy results of all primary field and Quality Control (QC) sample analyses.

QC criteria were defined in each method specific Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). Whenever results were outside established criteria, the laboratory analyst promptly implemented corrective actions in accord with the method specific SOPs. This section includes a summary discussion of the analysis results that were outside the method specified control limits and the DQOs for data precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness, comparability and sensitivity established in the SAP. A complete set of the results of the individual laboratory analysts' quality control analyses for this project are presented in Appendix D.

B.2.2 Laboratory QC Manager

The second tier was performed by the laboratory Quality Control (QC) Manager, who evaluated the batch and sample specific QC analysis results for conformance with the

precision and accuracy criteria for each method specific Standard Operating Procedure. The laboratory QC Manager assessed the primary sample analysis data relative to the supporting QC Analyses results and assigned data qualifiers wherever appropriate. The laboratory QC Manager prepared a case narrative of the analyses describing any out of control results and corrective actions implemented. The complete "Definitive Data Package" provided by Severn Trent Laboratory (STL) is included as Appendix D.

B.3 Altech Data Quality Assessment

The third tier of the data quality assessment was an independent QC evaluation of the laboratory data by Altech, which is presented here in Appendix B. This stage included review of the definitive data package of results provided by the STL laboratory, and the project DQOs for data precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness, comparability and sensitivity. It also included preparation of a summary set of tables (Tables B1 through B15) to aid organization, evaluation and presentation of the results. The Altech data quality assessment included review and evaluation of the complete data package presented in Appendix D for compliance with:

- Sample transport, custody and handling protocol;
- Documentation of extraction dates and analyses within specified holding times;
- Appropriate analytical method application, as scheduled in the SAP;
- Documentation of calibration results;
- Minimum detection levels prescribed in the SAP for each analyte;
- Field sample data results reporting and proper application of data qualifiers; and
- QC criteria for blind duplicate sample results for all analysis parameters.

Tables B-8 through B-10 depict the comparison of blind duplicate sample results, which also helped support calculation and evaluation of conformance to the Data Quality Objectives established for the project.

Appendix D presents the entire STL data report for this project, and it includes extensive calibration data, surrogate recovery, matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate chemical and statistical analyses to document data quality, consistent with the requirements for a "Definitive Data Package," as outlined the USACE "Shell for Analytical Chemistry Requirements." The results of all analyses performed by STL are also summarized in the Tables B-1 through B- 4 (field sediment samples); B-11, B-12, B-14 and B-15 (Rinse Blank and IDW samples).

B.3.1 Sample transport, custody and handling protocol

All samples were delivered by an Altech sampling team to the laboratory in coolers at the end of each day of sampling. A completed chain-of-custody form accompanied the samples, and the laboratory's completed cooler receipt form indicated that all samples arrived properly labeled and containerized. All temperature blanks at the time of receipt indicated temperatures in coolers were within the proper range, with the exception of the cooler received the evening of October 2, 2002. It contained the samples from Management Units 6 and 7. The initial temperature recorded was 9.7° C, but when the cooler was checked the next morning, the temperature was 2.1° C. It appears that there was insufficient time from

sample placement in the cooler to arrival at the laboratory for the temperature to properly cool from ambient.

B.3.2 Documentation of extraction dates and analyses within specified holding times

Tables B-5, B-6 an B-7 depict all dates of sampling, sample preparation and analysis, with the method specific allowable durations between these dates. All Primary and Secondary laboratory analyses were conducted within the required extraction and analysis periods.

As shown in Table 7, all four Tertiary Samples for SVOC Analyses were extracted 27 or 28 days after the date of sampling, which is twice the allowable period of 14 days, then analyzed eight days after extraction, which was within the required analysis period. Upon receipt of the Primary and Secondary Sample results on October 30, Altech Project Manager ordered TPH analyses of Tertiary Samples TS-1, TS-3, TS-5 and TS-10. Tertiary analyses were performed despite being outside allowable holding time as further exercise of due diligence in trying to quantify potential presence of toxic polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon compounds because 5 out of 26 total Primary and Secondary Samples exceeded residential single sample limit of 200 mg/Kg.

B.3.3 Appropriate analytical method application, as scheduled in the SAP

All Primary, Secondary and Tertiary samples analyzed, were analyzed in accord with the methods specified in the approved SAP.

B.3.4 Documentation of calibration results

Appendix D presents comprehensive results of the initial and continuing calibration analyses for each of the designated laboratory procedures. The results include plots of chromatographs and laboratory analyst notes and documentation of results and calculations. No problems with initial or continuing calibration of instruments were reported for any analysis.

B.3.5 Field sample data results reporting and proper application of data qualifiers

The Laboratory QC Manager followed the method specific Standard Operating Procedures to assign appropriate qualifiers to data. As shown in Tables B-1 though B-4, all non-detect results for all parameters were reported as the reporting limit concentration with a "U" symbol (data qualifier), which indicated that the analyte was not detected. Metals analyses, results below the Reporting Limit concentration yet above the Method Detection Limit were closely evaluated and an estimated concentration result was calculated. Some metals samples were detected at very low concentrations in several method blank samples. A "J" qualifier was assigned to the results for these analytes to indicate that the analyte was also detected in the blank, which indicates the results reported may be biased high. Metal results where an analyte was detected but where the concentration was below the reporting limit were assigned a "B" qualifier, indicating the result provided is the analyst's estimate of the low concentration present.

Similarly, where an organic compound was detected (Methods 8015B, 8270C, 8081A, 8082 and 9023) but below the reporting limit, a "J" qualifier was assigned indicating the result provided is the analyst's estimate of the low concentration present.

B.3.6 QC criteria for blind duplicate sample results for all analysis parameters

Tables B-8 through B-10 present a systematic comparison of all blind duplicate sample results. The results were compared to the criteria in USACE EM 200-1-6, "Chemical Quality Assurance for Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Waste Products." According to this guidance, the results were determined to be either in agreement or disagreement.

For all parameters, if one duplicate sample result was less than the detection limit for the analysis, the other sample result must be 5 times greater than the detection limit for the results to be considered in disagreement and 10 times greater to be considered in major disagreement. Likewise for all parameters, if one sample result was less than the reporting or practical quantitation limit for the analysis, the other sample result must be 3 times greater than the reporting limit to be considered in disagreement and 5 times greater to be considered in major disagreement.

When comparing duplicate sample results for metals, where both samples were determined to have concentrations above the reporting limit, the results were considered in disagreement if one sample is more than double the concentration of the other. They were considered in major disagreement if one is 3 or more times the other. For all other parameters where both duplicate samples were determined to have concentrations above the reporting limit, the results were considered in disagreement if one sample is more than 4 times the concentration of the other. They were considered in major disagreement if one is 5 or more times the other.

B.3.7 Review of Laboratory QC Documentation

As described above, definitive data assessment was initiated at the STL laboratory. The laboratory chemist checked the chain of custody forms, sample handling procedures, analyses requested sample description, labels-unique identification numbers and cooler receipt forms. The laboratory chemist performed initial and continuing calibration of method specific instrumentation using method blank samples, laboratory control and laboratory control duplicate samples. The laboratory method specific quality control for organic analyses methods included spiking field samples with known concentrations of specific surrogate compounds, checking the results and calculating percentage recoveries for compliance with method specific criteria. The laboratory chemist implemented corrective actions as appropriate to maintain proper control of all field sample analyses.

The laboratory QC Manager then checked the actual data, and specifically evaluated extraction and analysis dates relative to sampling dates for compliance with method specific holding time and preservation requirements. The laboratory QC Manager examined the batch specific QC mechanisms for each method, which included evaluation of initial and continuing calibration results, matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate results and surrogate recoveries for conformance with the method specific quality control criteria. To limit analysis costs, no trip blanks or equipment rinse blanks were included for this project.

However laboratory method blank samples were analyzed, and the laboratory QC Manager review included evaluation of these results.

The laboratory chemist and QC Manager data assessment included numerous calculations for the specific data quality indicators of precision and accuracy, and reviews to assure the representativeness, comparability and sensitivity of the data. Altech performed a separate evaluation of all of these parameters, with specific focus toward comparison of the blind duplicate analysis results. The following provides a discussion of the calculation, assessment and review of data quality indicators.

B.4 Chemical Data Quality Indicator DQO Assessment.

Data quality was evaluated through a set of qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques. Precision, accuracy, completeness and sensitivity are standard indicators/criteria for data quality that were quantitatively determined. Representativeness and comparability are standard data quality criteria that were qualitatively and/or semi-quantitatively evaluated. Below are the formulas, criteria and calculated results used to measure and assess data quality, both at the laboratory (as shown in Appendix D) and by the Altech QC Manager for the project.

B.4.1 Precision

Precision is defined as a measurement of the closeness of individual test results under prescribed conditions, and it reflects a combination of random and systematic error, as well as natural variation within a specific matrix. A field duplicate (QC) sample was used to assess matrix heterogeneity and field sampling and handling procedures. Laboratory precision was determined through various method specific analyses of calibration standards and laboratory control samples. Analysis of Matrix Spike and Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) samples was also used to determine laboratory precision for the specific soil matrices being investigated.

Statistical measures of precision include determination of relative percent difference (RPD), standard deviation (SD) and relative standard deviation (RSD). The RPD for a set of duplicate measurements of variable (X) is defined as:

Formula % RPD =
$$|(X_1-X_2)/[(X_1+X_2)/2]| * 100\%$$

Where: $X_1 = \text{Concentration in replicate } 1$

 X_2 = Concentration in replicate 2

When sufficient replicates were available, such as for continuing calibration analyses, precision can be expressed as the SD or the RSD.

$$SD = \sqrt{\left[\sum (X_i \text{-} X)^2 / (n\text{-}1)\right]}$$

% RSD = (SD/Mean) * 100%

The results of MS/MSD precision calculations performed by STL on laboratory duplicate samples are presented in Appendix D. The result of the comparison of the blind field duplicate samples for precision is presented in Tables B-8 through B-10.

The precision acceptability criteria specified in the "Shell for Analytical Chemistry Requirements" were adopted for all analytical methods used for this project. Only data generated within the required precision criteria or otherwise specifically qualified were deemed usable and included in the body of this report. The Laboratory QA Manager, prior to rejecting data as unusable, closely evaluated the data for potential matrix interference and its effects on the results and provided a case narrative of any limitations to the data relative to established control limits for method precision.

The Altech QC Manager for the project closely evaluated the duplicate sample results for precision. As specified in EM 200-1-6, if one duplicate sample result for any parameter was less than the detection limit for the analysis, the other sample result must be 5 times greater than the detection limit for the pair to be considered in disagreement and 10 times greater to be considered in major disagreement. Likewise for all parameters, if one sample result was less than the reporting or practical quantitation limit for the analysis, the other sample result must be 3 times greater than the reporting limit to be considered in disagreement and 5 times greater to be considered in major disagreement.

When comparing duplicate sample results for metals, where both samples were determined to have concentrations above the reporting limit, the results were considered in disagreement if one sample is more than double the concentration of the other.

As shown in Tables B-8 thru B-10, all duplicate sample results were in agreement for all analysis parameters, with one exception. Samples SS-5b and SS-10b were in disagreement for TPH, with the concentration found in SS-10b at nearly four times the concentration found in SS-5b. The data presented in the body of this report meets the established precision criteria and is considered useable for investigation hypothesis testing.

B.4.2 Accuracy

Accuracy measures the bias in a measurement system. Laboratory blanks were used to determine bias or contribution of potential contaminants of concern from various outside sources. Each batch of samples for each method included surrogate spikes, matrix spikes and laboratory control samples to evaluate accuracy. Accuracy for each method of analysis for organic compounds (non-metals) was defined as the percent recovery (%R) of a sample spiked with a known concentration of a specific analyte or group of analytes. Accuracy was primarily determined through the spiking samples with surrogate compounds (compounds not included in the target list of analytes), measuring the concentration of each surrogate in the analysis of each field sample and calculating the percent recovery. Only data generated within the method specific required accuracy criteria was deemed usable. However, the Laboratory QA Manager, prior to rejecting data as unusable, closely evaluated the data for potential matrix interference and its effects on the results.

$$%R = [(X_s-X_u)/K] * 100\%$$

Where:

 X_s = Measured Concentration in the Spiked Sample X_u = Measured Concentration in the Unspiked Sample

K = Known amount of spike in the sample

Tables B-11 and B-12 summarize QC analyses to measure accuracy. While most QC analyses results were within method specified control limits for accuracy, a few were outside established control limits. In several cases, recovery of the TPH surrogate, nonane, was below recovery percentage limits, and method blank contamination was detected in one batch of analyses for TPH. PS-9 was selected as the field sample for matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses for TPH, EOX, Chlordane, PCBs and Chlorides. TPH recoveries in PS-9MS and PS-9MSD were outside (below) control limits. However the RPD between the MS and MSD results were within control limits, and the recovery of the surrogate, nonane, was within control limits for both analyses. All other MS/MSD results were within established control limits.

The data presented in the body of this report meets the established accuracy criteria and is considered useable for investigation hypothesis testing.

B.5 Representativeness

Representativeness is a semi-quantitative indicator of data quality. It requires sufficient and proper numbers, frequency, and locations of samples, so as to assure that sample data accurately and precisely represent the selected characteristics of the media sampled. The methods and equipment prescribed in the SAP to collect, store and transport samples were designed to minimize the loss/introduction of target analytes from/into a sample from the point of collection to delivery to the laboratory.

The number and location of Management Units; the number, random location and selected depths of borings; and the types and numbers of samples collected in each Management Unit were designed to provide a statistical basis to evaluate the results. All borings were advanced within close proximity to the location designated, specified depths were achieved, and sufficient volumes were recovered to fill all chemical and geotechnical sample jars specified. The Field Sampling Team Leader documented sampling activities and noted any discrepancies between planned and actual methods of collection, storage and transport of samples. The boring records in Appendix A provide detailed accounts of the field sampling and indicate the procedures specified in the FSP were meticulously followed.

All laboratory methods specified in the SAP were utilized, and the Rinse Blank and Trip Blank sample analysis results indicate that no target analytes were introduced to the samples by way of the sampling, preparation, packaging or transport methods. All Primary and Secondary analyses were conducted within the method prescribed limits. The Tertiary analyses were outside the prescribed holding time limit for SVOCs. While the SVOC analyses were generally within all other specified limits and samples were kept refrigerated, there is potential for loss or breakdown of target compounds. The data is considered representative for qualitative assessment, but because of the potential for loss or breakdown of target compounds, it is not considered suitable for quantitative assessment and investigation hypothesis testing. All of the Primary and Secondary Sample data is considered representative of actual site conditions and is useable for investigation hypothesis testing.

B.6 Completeness

Completeness was measured by dividing the number of usable sample results to the total number of sample results. The completeness objective for this project was for 95% of the planned data to be usable (samples collected and analyses generated within the established control limits for precision and accuracy). Completeness was calculated using the following formula:

$$%C = (V/N) * 100\%$$

Where:

V = Number of measurements judged valid

N = Number of valid measurements needed to achieve the

specified statistical level of confidence

Completeness was calculated to be 100% of the Primary and Secondary Data.

B.7 Comparability

Standardized methods of field analysis, sample collection, holding times, and sample preservation were planned and implemented on this project. No significant deviations from the planned methods of sample collection or prescribed analysis procedures occurred, and the data quality indicator for comparability was achieved, such that observations and conclusions may be directly compared with historical and/or available background data.

B.8 Sensitivity

Table B-13 provides a comprehensive list of analytes with the Severn Trent Laboratories (STL) laboratory's target Reporting Limit and Method Detection Limit objectives, which were established in the project specific Sampling and Analysis Plan. The Method Detection Limit is the lowest value, above which, a specific chemical can be identified in the soil at a 95% level of confidence. The Reporting Limit is a higher value, above which, the concentration of a specific chemical in the soil can be quantitatively determined within method prescribed limits for precision and accuracy.

An integral component of the Sampling and Analysis Plan for this project was to assure that quantitation limits for all selected chemical parameters were below 25-50% of the corresponding regulatory criteria for the substance, if practically achievable. All significant discrepancies between target and actual limits of detection and quantitation are described below.

Documented Reporting Limits for TPH varied from 10 to as much as 97 mg/Kg. No non-detect results were reported for TPH, and all analysis results were within appropriate QC criteria for the concentration reported. One sample, PS-7 has a j qualifier, indicating the result is an estimated value, below the practical limits of analysis, 15 mg/Kg.

The target RL for Chlordane was 2 ug/Kg, but was unattainable in any sample analysis. RLs for analyses varied between 18 and 27 ug/Kg. All MDLs were below 2 ug/Kg, and

Chlordane was not detected in any sample. The target RL for individual PCB aroclors was 33 ug/Kg, and actual RLs varied between 34 and 52 ug/Kg. All PCB MDLs were below 13 ug/Kg, and no PCB was detected in any sample.

The laboratory QC Manager evaluated Method Detection and Reporting Limits to assure that minimum detection limits were maintained throughout the analyses, and assigned data qualifiers to estimated concentration data where appropriate. The method detection limits for all analyses were the lowest concentration that an analyte could be detected at a 95% confidence level, but not accurately quantified. The reporting limits for all analyses were the lowest concentration that an analyte could be quantified within method prescribed criteria for precision and accuracy.

In general, the analyses were all conducted to the Method Detection and Reporting Limits prescribed in the Sampling and Analysis Plan, with minor differences between actual and prescribed limits based on differences in soil moisture content. The only appreciable difference between planed and actual Reporting and Detection Limits occurred in the Method 8015B analyses. Actual Reporting Limits were up to 20 times higher for some of the analyses due to variations in moisture content and required dilutions, but were sufficiently below regulatory action levels to allow data use in supporting investigation hypothesis testing.

Table B-1 - North Park and Marshall Lakes Primary Sediment Sample Results

Analytical Parameter		EOX (mg/Kg)	Chlordane (ug/Kg)	PCBs (ug/Kg)	Lead (mg/Kg)	Chlorides (mg/Kg)
		Draft	Dredging Gu	uideline Li	imits	
Primary Sample Number	120mg/Kg Unrestricted use - 200 single sample limit residential - 500 single sample non-residential	25 mg/Kg Unrestricted use - 50 single sample Ilmit	20 ug/Kg	1000 ug/Kg	45 mg/Kg	No Standard
PS-1	130	<18	<22*	<43	38	91.8
PS-2	83	<16	<20	<39	39.2	52.2
PS-3	210	<20	<25*	<48	49.6	19.3
PS-4	43	<16	<21*	<41	39.1	83.8
PS-5	180	<21	<27*	<52	66.7	184
PS-10	210	<22	<27*	<52	63.1	177
PS-6	23	<18	<21*	<41	25.3	81.8
PS-7	12j	<14	<20	<38	24.9	37.1
PS-8	16	<14	<18	<34	15.8	27.1
PS-9	24	<16	<22*	<42	23.8	80.3
Mean	91.9				38.55	

Table B-2 - North Park Lake Secondary Sediment Sample Results

Seconda Sample I	Number	TRPH-DRO (mg/Kg)	Lead (mg/Kg)			TRPH- DRO (mg/Kg)	Lead (mg/Kg)
Manager	nent						
Unit 1	PS-1	130	38	Managemer	nt Unit 5	180	66.7
	SS-1a	86			SS-5a	160	72.6
	SS-1b	75			SS-5b	28	59.3
	SS-1c	71			SS-5c	230	64.3
	SS-1d	38			SS-5d	84	78.6
SS	-1 Mean	80		S	S-5 Mean	136.4	68.3
Manager	nent			Managem	ent Unit 5		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Unit 3	PS-3	210	49.6	Duplica	te PS-10	210	63.1
	SS-3a	90	55.3		SS-10a	140	67.6
	SS-3b	92	48.9		SS-10b	110	60.9
	SS-3c	98	54.6		SS-10c	97	54.3
	SS-3d	30	70.6		SS-10d	230	84.8
SS	-3 Mean	104	55.8	SS	-10 Mean	157.4	66.1

^{*} Reporting Limit Exceeds required RL, but MDL was 1.1 ug/Kg or less for all analyses.

Bold font indicates result exceeds PADEP Unrestricted Use Criteria: TPH>120 mg/Kg; Lead.45 mg/Kg.

j - Indicates value reported is an estimated value, which is below Reporting Limit for analysis.

PS-metalsAppBTables.xls

Table B-3 - North Park and Marshall Lakes Primary Sediment Sample **Metals Analysis Results**

7	LADEP	Clean Fill	Standard	BV/BIII		3	0	500	0.1	2		70	470	0 05	9	20		40	0	20		9	40		0.6		100			
DANED	-	_	otaridard ma/Ko	BY IS	19000	27 00	12	8200	320	38	NS	19000	24	4300	90009	450	NS	31000	10	650	NS	26	84	NS	14	1500	7500			
0 00	3	C2J100102001	ma/Ka	D.	8630 1		7.2	123	1.2 J	0.089 B	1320 J	15	10.4	14.7	24100	23.8	2000	502	0.055 B	19.2	666 B	0.49 B	0.12 B	146 B	1.7 U	16.8	85.1 J			
DS. 8) -	C2J010317001	ma/Ka		7470 J	8.4 U	6.5	86.7	1.1	0.7 U	1290 J	12.9	9.5	12.3	21600	15.8	1810	609	0.043 B	15.7	460 B	0.67 B	0.13 B	71 B	1.4 U	16.3	52.4 J			evel
PS-7	.) .	SOI 10	ma/Ka		8630 J	9.2 U	7.5	118	1.3 J	0.049 B	1420 J	17.8	10.7	16.3	26100	24.9	2020	564	0.073	18.7	464 B	0.49 B	0.13 B	91.4 B	1.5 U	17.9	82.3 J			t a reportable
PS-6	021020404000	SOLID	mg/Kg		f 0666	10 U	8.9	148	1.5 J	0.14B	1830 J	16.3	7-	19	26300	25.3	2330	438	0.1	20.8	558 B		0.13 B	127 B	1.7 U	20.9	92.4 J			get analyte a
PS-10	C2 1040402008	SOLID	mg/Kg		12900 J	12.6 U	11.9	167	1.8	0.42 B	2750 J	22.5	14	28.7	33000	63.1	3050	948	0.12	27.5	914 B		0.29 B	261 B	2.1 U	56	159 J	d.		ntains the tar
PS-5	C2 1040102001	SOLID	mg/Kg		13400 J	12.6 U	11.7	171	1.7 J	0.49 B	2740 J	22.9	14.2	29.1	32900	66.7	3090	930	0.12	27.9	1010 B			246 B	2.1 U	26.4	162 J	ng Limit liste	nit.	od blank co
PS-4	C2 1080243004		mg/Kg		7900 J	10 U	8.8	101		0.19 B	1730 J	14.8	9.7	18.1	22700	39.1	1850	642	0.1 J	16.6	405 B	0.84 U	0.13 B	126 B	1.7 U	18.2	98.3 J	ed at Reporti	Reporting Lim	sociated met
PS-3	C2 1040308001	SOLID	mg/Kg		10800 J	11.6 U	8.5	128		0.24 B	2390 J	19.7	12.4	24.1	27300	49.6	2670	741	0.11	-		0.91 B		213 B	1.9 U	20.8	142 J	te not detect	is less than F	ation. The as
PS-2	_		mg/Kg		9820 J	9.5 U	6.9	113		0.17 B	1910 J	16.7	10.8	18.7	23400	39.2	2310	579	0.097 J		664 B	0.73 B		91.2 B	1.6 U	18.8	110 J	= Non-Detect result. Analyte not detected at Reporting Limit listed	=Estimated result. Result is less than Reporting Lir	ink contamin
PS-1	C2.1040308008	1	mg/Kg		8260 J	10.4 U	7.5	105		0.37 B	3130 J	17.6	10.9	21.9	23300	38	2220	623	0.087	=					1.7 U	18.5	129 J	= Non-Detec	=Estimated r	Method blank contamination. The associated method blank contains the target analyte at a reportable level.
Sample ID	-	Matrix	Units	Metals	Aluminum	Antimony	Arsenic	Barium	Beryllium	Sadmium	Salcium	Chromium	Cobalt	Copper	ron	Lead	Magnesium	Manganese	Mercury	Nickel	Potassium	Selenium	Silver	Sodium	Thallium	Vanadium	Zinc		æ	ſ

Table B-4 - North Park Lake Tertiary Sediment Sample Results

Sample ID	TS	S-1	T	S-3	T	S-5	TS	5-10
STL Sample ID	C2J300	260004	C2J30	0260003	C2J30	0260001		0260002
Location		_	i	ng 3a	Bori	ng 5d	Boring 50 Duplicate	
Sample Interval		- 9'	0'	- 8'	0'	- 8'	0'	- 8'
Semi Volatile Organic Compound	ug/Kg		ug/Kg		ug/Kg		ug/Kg	
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	540		610	U	630	U	680	U
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	540	U	610		630	U	680	U
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2,2'-oxybis(1-Chloropropane)	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2,4-Dichlorophenol	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2,4-Dimethylphenol	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2,4-Dinitrophenol	2600	U	2900	U	3100	U	3300	U
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2-Chloronaphthalene	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2-Chlorophenol	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2-Methylnaphthalene	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2-Methylphenol	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
2-Nitroaniline	2600	U	2900	U	3100	U	3300	U
2-Nitrophenol	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	2600	U	2900	U	3100	U	3300	U
3-Nitroaniline	2600	U	2900	U	3100	U	3300	U
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	2600	U	2900	U	3100	U	3300	U
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
4-Chloroaniline	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
4-Methylphenol	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
4-Nitroaniline	2600	U	2900	U	3100	U	3300	U
4-Nitrophenol	2600	U	2900	U	3100	U	3300	U
Acenaphthene	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
Acenaphthylene	540	U	610	U	630		680	U
Anthracene	540	U	610	U	630		680	
Benzo(a)anthracene	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
Benzo(a)pyrene	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	74	J	610	U	630		680	
Benzo(ghi)perylene	51	J	610	U	630	U	680	U
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
bis(2-Chloroethoxy)methane	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U

Table B-4 - North Park Lake Tertiary Sediment Sample Results

Sample ID	TS	S-1	Т	S-3	T	S-5	TS	S-10
STL Sample ID	C2J300	0260004	C2J30	0260003	C2J30	0260001		0260002
Location	Bori	_		ng 3a		ng 5d	Boring 50 Duplicate	
Sample Interval		- 9'		- 8'	0'	- 8'	0'	- 8'
Semi Volatile Organic Compound	ug/Kg		ug/Kg		ug/Kg		ug/Kg	
bis(2-Chloroethyl) ether	540		610	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	630	U	680	U
bis(2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate	260	J	220	J	190	J	680	U
Butyl benzyl phthalate	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
Carbazole	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	
Chrysene	55	J	610	U	630	U	680	U
Di-n-butyl phthalate	360	J	310	J	360	J	430	
Di-n-octyl phthalate	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	540	U	610	U	630		680	
Dibenzofuran	540	U	610	U	630	U	680	U
Diethyl phthalate	540		610	 	630		680	
Dimethyl phthalate	540	U	610	U	630		680	
Fluoranthene	98	J	610		630		680	
Fluorene	540		610		630		680	
Hexachlorobenzene	540		610		630		680	
Hexachlorobutadiene	540		610		630		680	
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	2600		2900		3100		3300	
Hexachloroethane	540		610		630		680	
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	48		610		630		680	
Isophorone	540		610		630		680	
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	540		610		630		680	
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	540		610		630		680	
Naphthalene	540		610		630		680	
Nitrobenzene	540		610		630		680	
Pentachlorophenol	2600		2900		3100		3300	
Phenanthrene	52		610		630		680	
Phenol	540		610		630		680	
Pyrene	71		610		630		680	
								······································
Surrogate Recovery Percentages 2,4,6-Tribromophenol	0.99	*	34	*	AC		53	
2,4,6-1 Horomophenol 2-Fluorobiphenyl	76		74	•	73		72	
2-Fluorophenol	3.6	*	41		44		55	
Nitrobenzene-d5	74		72		70		70	
Phenol-d5	23	*	56		59		63	
Terphenyl-d14	63		65		82	(1. 1	80	
NOTE: Tertiary Sample Analyses for SemiV U - Indicates analyte was not detected.	olatile Org	anic Compo	ounds were	performed	outside Mei	tnod require	ed holding t	ime.
J - Indicates value reported is an estimated va		is below R	eporting Li	mit for anal	ysis.			
* - Inicates result is outside control limits for								
Bold font inicates detected analyte.							1	

Table B-5 - Comparison of Actual to Allowed Duration Between Sampling, Extraction and Analysis of Primary Samples

		TPH	EOX	Obles	laca	Ta a	r
		Preparation/	1	Chlordane	PCB	Metals	Chlorides
Primary	Sample	Analysis	Preparation /Analysis	/Analysis	Preparation/		
Sample	Date	Date	Date	Date	Analysis Date	Analysis Date	/Analysis Date
Number (1)	Allowable					Date	Date
	Duration	14/40 days	28 days	14/40 days	14/40 days	6 months	28 days
PS-1	4-Oct-02	5-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	23-Oct-02
		8-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	11-Oct-02	26-Oct-02
Actual Duration		1/3 days	5 days	3/1 days	3/1 days	7 days	22 days
DQO Comparison		OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
PS-2	7-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	23-Oct-02
		11-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	14-Oct-02	14-Oct-02	11-Oct-02	26-Oct-02
Actual Duration		2/2 days	3 days	3/4 days	3/4 days	4 days	19 days
DQO Comparison		OK	OK	OK	OK .	OK	OK
PS-3	4-Oct-02	5-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	23-Oct-02
		8-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	11-Oct-02	26-Oct-02
Actual Duration		1/3 days	5 days	3/1 days	3/1 days	7 days	22 days
DQO Comparison		OK	OK	OK	OK .	OK	OK
PS-4	8-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	23-Oct-02
		11-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	14-Oct-02	14-Oct-02	11-Oct-02	26-Oct-02
Actual Duration		1/2 days	2 days	2/4 days	2/4 days	3 days	18 days
DQO Comparison		OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
PS-5	3-Oct-02	5-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	23-Oct-02
		8-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	11-Oct-02	26-Oct-02
Actual Duration		2/3 days	6 days	4/1 days	4/1 days	8 days	23 days
DQO Comparison		OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
PS-10	3-Oct-02	5-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	23-Oct-02
		8-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	11-Oct-02	26-Oct-02
Actual Duration		2/3 days	6 days	4/1 days	4/1 days	8 days	23 days
DQO Comparison		OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
PS-6	2-Oct-02	4-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	23-Oct-02
		7-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	11-Oct-02	26-Oct-02
Actual Duration		2/3 days	7 days	5/1 days	5/1 days	9 days OK	24 days OK
DQO Comparison		OK	OK	OK	OK		
PS-7	2-Oct-02	4-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	23-Oct-02
Actual Description		7-Oct-02	9-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	11-Oct-02	26-Oct-02
Actual Duration DQO Comparison		2/3 days OK	7 days OK	5/1 days OK	5/1 days OK	9 days OK	24 days OK
	1.0 + 30						
PS-8	1-Oct-02	2-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	7-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	23-Oct-02
A - 4 1 D		3-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	8-Oct-02	11-Oct-02	26-Oct-02
Actual Duration		1/1 days OK	7 days OK	6/1 days OK	6/1 days OK	10 days OK	25 days OK
DQO Comparison	0.0 / 00						
PS-9	9-Oct-02	16-Oct-02	14-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	23-Oct-02
A-415		17-Oct-02	14-Oct-02	14-Oct-02	14-Oct-02	11-Oct-02	26-Oct-02
Actual Duration DQO Comparison		7/1 days OK	5 days OK	1/4 days OK	1/4 days OK	2 days OK	17 days OK
Prac combanson		70	Š	UN.		<u> </u>	UI.

Table B-6 - Comparison of Actual to Allowed Duration Between Sampling, Extraction and Analysis of Secondary Samples

		TPH			Metals		
	Sample	Preparation/	Actual	DQO	Preparation/		DQO
Secondary	Date	Analysis	Duration	Comparison	Analysis	Duration	Comparison
Sample		Date		,	Date		o o in parioon
Number (2)	Allowable Duration	14/40 d	ays	· .	6 mont	:hs	
SS-1a	4-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	6 days	OK			
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK			
SS-1b	4-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	6 days	OK			
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK			
SS-1c	4-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	6 days	OK			
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK			
SS-1d	4-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	6 days	OK			
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK			
SS-3a	4-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	6 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK	19-Oct-02	15 days	OK
SS-3b	4-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	6 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		15-Oct-02	5 days	OK	19-Oct-02	15 days	OK
SS-3c	4-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	6 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		15-Oct-02	5 days	OK	19-Oct-02	15 days	OK
SS-3d	4-Oct-02	16-Oct-02	12 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		17-Oct-02	1 days	OK	19-Oct-02	15 days	OK
SS-5a	3-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	7 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK	19-Oct-02	16 days	OK
SS-5b	3-Oct-02	16-Oct-02	13 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		17-Oct-02	1 days	OK	19-Oct-02	16 days	OK
SS-5c	3-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	7 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK	19-Oct-02	16 days	OK
SS-5d	3-Oct-02	16-Oct-02	13 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		17-Oct-02	1 days	OK	19-Oct-02	16 days	OK
SS-10a	3-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	7 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK	19-Oct-02	16 days	OK
SS-10b	3-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	7 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK	19-Oct-02	16 days	OK
SS-10c	3-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	7 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK	19-Oct-02	16 days	OK
SS-10d	3-Oct-02	10-Oct-02	7 days	OK	18-Oct-02		
		14-Oct-02	4 days	OK	19-Oct-02	16 days	OK

Table B-7 - Comparison of Actual to Allowed Duration Between Sampling, Extraction and Analysis of Tertiary Samples

Tertiary	Sample Date	SVOC Preparation/Analysis	Actual	DQO Comparison
Sample Number (3)		Allowable = 14/40 days		
	4-Oct-02	31-Oct-02	27 days	13 days over
TS-1 AD-1c		8-Nov-02	9 days	ÓK
	4-Oct-02	31-Oct-02	27 days	13 days over
TS-3 AD 3a		8-Nov-02	9 days	ŎK
	3-Oct-02	31-Oct-02	28 days	14 days over
TS-5 AD-5d		8-Nov-02	9 days	ŎK
	3-Oct-02	31-Oct-02	28 days	14 days over
TS-10 AD 5d split		8-Nov-02	9 days	ÓΚ
NOTE: Bold font indi	cates excedence	e of Method Specific QC criteria		

Table B-8 - North Park Lake QC Comparison of Split Duplicate Primary and Secondary Sample Results

Analytical	TRPH-DRO	EOX	Chlordane	PCBs	Lood	Chlorid
Parameter		(mg/Kg)	(ug/Kg)	(ug/Kg)	Lead (mg/Kg)	Chlorides (mg/Kg)
		Draft	Dredging G			(9/119/
	120mg/Kg Unrestricted use - 200 single sample limit residential - 500 single sample non-residential	25 mg/Kg Unrestricted use - 50 single sample	20 ug/Kg	1000 ug/Kg	45 mg/Kg	No Standard
DQO Criteria	<3x difference	<4x difference	<4x difference	<4x difference	<2x difference	<4x difference
Sample Number						
PS-5	180	<21	<27*	<52	66.7	184
PS-10	210	<22	<27*	<52	63.1	177
RPD	15.38%	ND	ND	ND	5.55%	3.88%
Ratio	1.167				0.946	0.962
Comparison	Agreement				Agreement	Agreement
SS-5a	160				72.6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
SS-10a	140				67.6	
RPD	13.33%				7.13%	
Ratio	0.875				0.931	
Comparison	Agreement				Agreement	
SS-5b	28				59.3	
SS-10b	110				60.9	
RPD	118.84%				2.66%	
Ratio	3.929				1.027	
Comparison	Disagreement				Agreement	
SS-5c	230				64.3	-
SS-10c	97				54.3	
RPD	81.35%				16.86%	
Ratio	0.422				0.844	
Comparison	Agreement				Agreement	
SS-5d	84				78.6	
SS-10d	230				84.8	
RPD	92.99%				7.59%	
Ratio	2.738				1.079	
Comparison	Agreement				Agreement	
December 1 to 10 mm		MOL				
Reporting Limit Exceeds Sold font indicates result						
- Indicates value reporte					sis.	

metalsQCAppBTables.xls

Table B-9 - North Park Lake QC Comparison of Split Duplicate Primary Metal

Sample Results

					300				
Sample ID	PS-5	PS-10	PS-5	PS-10		PADEP	PADEP	Ratio DQO	DQO
STL Sample ID	C2J040102001	C2J040102008	C2J040102001	C2J040102008			Clean Fill	PS-10	Criteria
Matrix	SOLID	SOLID	SOLID	SOLID	Relative %	Standard	Standard	PS-5	< 2x difference
Units	mg/Kg	mg/Kg	mg/Kg	mg/Kg	Difference	mg/Kg	mg/Kg		
Metals									
Aluminum	13400 J	12900 J	13400	12900	3.8%	190000		0.963	Agreement
Antimony	12.6 U	12.6 U	12.6	12.6	%0.0	27.00	3	1.000	Agreement
Arsenic	11.7	11.9	11.7	11.9	1.7%	12	0.3	1.017	Agreement
Barium	171	167	171	167	2.4%	8200	200	0.977	Agreement
Beryllium	1.7 J	1.8 J	1.7	1.8	2.7%	320	0.1	1.059	Agreement
Cadmium	0.49 B	0.42 B	0.49	0.45	15.4%	38	2	0.857	Agreement
Calcium	2740 J	2750 J	2740	2750	0.4%	NS		1.004	Agreement
Chromium	22.9	22.5	22.9	22.5	1.8%	19000	70	0.983	Agreement
Cobalt	14.2	14	14.2	14	1.4%	24	470	0.986	Agreement
Copper	29.1	28.7	29.1	28.7	1.4%	4300	0.05	0.986	Agreement
Iron	32900	33000	32900	33000	0.3%	00099		1.003	Agreement
Lead	66.7	63.1	66.7	63.1	5.5%	450	20	0.946	Agreement
Magnesium	3090	3050	3090	3050	1.3%	NS		0.987	Agreement
Manganese	930	948	930	948	1.9%	31000	40	1.019	Agreement
Mercury	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.0%	10	2	1.000	Agreement
Nickel	27.9	27.5	27.9	27.5	1.4%	650	20	0.986	Agreement
Potassium	1010 B	914 B	1010	914	10.0%	NS		0.905	Agreement
Selenium	0.94 B	1.3	0.94	1.3	32.1%	26	9	1.383	Agreement
Silver	0.3 B	0.29 B	0.3	0.29	3.4%	84	40	0.967	Agreement
Sodium	246 B	261 B	246	261	5.9%	NS		1.061	Agreement
Thallium	2.1 U	2.1 U	2.1	2.1	%0.0	14	9.0	1.000	Agreement
Vanadium	26.4	26	26.4	26	1.5%	1500		0.985	Agreement
Zinc	162 J	159 J	162	159	1.9%	7500	100	0.981	Agreement
n	= Non-Dete	= Non-Detect result. Analy	lyte not detec	te not detected at Reporting	ng Limit listed.				
В	=Estimated	=Estimated result. Result	t is less than I	s less than Reporting Limit	i.		•		
	= Memod D	lank contarnii	lallon. The as	sociated men	 Method Diank containination. The associated method diank contains the target analyte at a reportable level 	ins the target	analyte at a rep	ortable lev	<u>.</u>

Table B-10 - North Park Lake QC Comparison of Tertiary Split

Duplicate Sample Results

			<u>ample l</u>	Results			
Sample ID	TS-5		TS-10	TS-5	TS-10	Ratio	DQO
STL Sample ID	C2J30026000) l	C2J300260002	C2J300260001	C2J300260002	PS-10	Criteria
Location	Boring 5	5d	Boring 5d -	Boring 5d	Boring 5d -	PS-5	_
Sample Interval	0' - 8'		Duplicate 0' - 8'	0' - 8'	Duplicate 0' - 8'		< 5x difference
Semi Volatile Organic Compound	ug/Kg		ug/Kg	ug/Kg			difference
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	630		680 U	630	680	1.079	
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	630		680 U	630	680	1.079	
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	630		680 U	630	680	1.079	
2,2'-oxybis(1-Chloropropane)	630		680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	630		680 U	630	680	1.079	
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	
2,4-Dichlorophenol	630		680 U	630	680	1.079	
2,4-Dimethylphenol	630		680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
2,4-Dinitrophenol	3100	Ū	3300 U	3100	3300	1.065	
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	630		680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	630		680 U	630	680	1.079	
2-Chloronaphthalene	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
2-Chlorophenol	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	
2-Methylnaphthalene	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
2-Methylphenol	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
2-Nitroaniline	3100	U	3300 U	3100	3300	1.065	Agreement
2-Nitrophenol	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	3100	U	3300 U	3100	3300	1.065	Agreement
3-Nitroaniline	3100	U	3300 U	3100	3300	1.065	Agreement
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	3100	U	3300 U	3100	3300	1.065	Agreement
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
4-Chloroaniline	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
4-Methylphenol	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
4-Nitroaniline	3100	Ū	3300 U	3100	3300	1.065	Agreement
4-Nitrophenol	3100	U	3300 U	3100	3300	1.065	Agreement
Acenaphthene	630		680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
Acenaphthylene	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
Anthracene	630	U	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
Benzo(a)anthracene	630	U	680 U		680	1.079	Agreement
Benzo(a)pyrene	630	U	680 U		680	1.079	Agreement
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	630	Ū	680 U	630	680	1.079	Agreement
Benzo(ghi)perylene	630	U	680 U	630	680		Agreement
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	630		680 U		680	1.079	Agreement

Table B-10 - North Park Lake QC Comparison of Tertiary Split

Duplicate Sample Results Sample ID TS-5 **TS-10** TS-5 TS-10 Ratio DOO STL Sample ID Criteria C2J300260001 C2J300260002 **PS-10** C21300260001 C2J300260002 Boring 5d -Boring 5d -PS-5 Location Boring 5d Boring 5d Duplicate Duplicate < 5x Sample Interval · 0' - 8' 0' - 8' 0' - 8'0' - 8' difference Semi Volatile Organic Compound ug/Kg ug/Kg ug/Kg ug/Kg bis(2-Chloroethoxy)methane 630 U 680 U 630 1.079 Agreement 680 bis(2-Chloroethyl) ether 630 U 680 U 630 1.079 Agreement 680 bis(2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate 190 J 680 U 190 680 3.579 Agreement Butyl benzyl phthalate 630 U 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement Carbazole 630 U 680 U 630 1.079 Agreement 680 Chrysene 630 U 680 U 630 1.079 Agreement 680 Di-n-butyl phthalate 360 J 430 J 360 430 1.194 Agreement Di-n-octyl phthalate 630 U 680 U 630 1.079 Agreement 680 Dibenz(a,h)anthracene 630 U 680 U 1.079 Agreement 630 680 Dibenzofuran 630 U 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement Diethyl phthalate 630 U 680 U 1.079 Agreement 630 680 Dimethyl phthalate 630 U 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement Fluoranthene 630 U 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement Fluorene 630 U 1.079 Agreement 680 U 630 680 Hexachlorobenzene 680 U 630 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement Hexachlorobutadiene 630 U 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement Hexachlorocyclopentadiene 1.065 Agreement 3100 U 3300 U 3100 3300 Hexachloroethane 680 U 1.079 Agreement 630 U 630 680 Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene 630 U 680 U 1.079 Agreement 630 680 Isophorone 630 U 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement 680 U 1.079 Agreement N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine 630 U 630 680 N-Nitrosodiphenylamine 630 U 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement Naphthalene 630 U 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement Nitrobenzene 630 U 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement Pentachlorophenol 3100 U 3300 U 3100 3300 1.065 Agreement Phenanthrene 630 U 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement Phenol 680 U 630 680 1.079 Agreement 630 U 1.079 Agreement 680 630 U 680 U 630 Pyrene Surrogate Recovery Percentages 2,4,6-Tribromophenol 46 53 2-Fluorobiphenyl 73 72 55 2-Fluorophenol 44 70 Nitrobenzene-d5 70 59 63 Phenol-d5 Terphenyl-d14 80 NOTE: Tertiary Sample Analyses for SemiVolatile Organic Compounds were performed outside Method required holding time. U - Indicates analyte was not detected. J - Indicates value reported is an estimated value, which is below Reporting Limit for analysis. Bold font indicates detected analyte. - Inicates result is outside control limits for analysis.

Table B-11 - North Park Lake PaDEP Parameters QC and Investigation Derive Waste Sample Results

	RB-1	DR-1 (IDW)		SM 6-Sd	PS-9 MSD	Recovery I imite	CIGA	PDD I imite
TPH (as Diesel) (ug/L)	<100	<100		33% a	39% a	(70-130)	4.3	(0-20)
Surrogate Recoveries								
C9 (nonane)	32%	0.071 % *	* % 26.0	21%	18%	(10-110)		
EOX (ug/L)	<30	<30		72.44%	72.12%		99.0	
Chlordane								
(technical) ug/L	<0.5	<0.5						
Surrogate Recoveries								
Decachlorobiphenyl	95%	92%				- 1947		
Tetrachloro-m-xylene	%88	%08						
PCBs (ug/L)	RB-1	DR-1 (IDW)		PS-9 MS	PS-9 MSD	Recovery Limits	RPD	RPD Limits
Aroclor 1016	\ \ \	\ 		75%	%92	(26-144)	0.67	(0-39)
Aroclor 1221	-\-\	\ <u>\</u>						, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Aroclor 1232	<1	<1						
Aroclor 1242	^	1 >				Total control of the		
Aroclor 1248	1>	1 >						
Aroclor 1254	L>	\ \						
Aroclor 1260	>	^		%98	87%	(37-138)	1.8	(0-33)
Surrogate Recoveries								
Decachlorobiphenyl	%98	87%						
Tetrachloro-m-xylene	74%	75%						
	RB-1	DR-1 (IDW)		PS-9 MS	PS-9 MSD	Recovery Limits	RPD	RPD Limits
Chlorides (mg/L)	۲>	111		104%	106%	(75-125)	1.8	(0-20)

^{*} The surrogate recovery of nonane was below the control limits for DR-1. The sample was reextracted outside the holding, and the surrogate recovery was again outside control limits, confirming interference.

a The matrix spike and the matrix spike duplicate were outside control limits, and the Relative Percent Difference between the samples was within control limits.

metals QC&IDWAppBTables.xls

S
프
S
Re
Φ
<u></u>
m
San
ñ
3
8
0
$\boldsymbol{\sigma}$
ပ
QC and
_
a
¥
Š
9
ake.
ٽر
し
Ť
ā
Ω.
_
판
ō
Ž
7
م
12
, d
Ш
Table I
5
a

						7	n			_	В									\supset				В	_								
DR-1	C2J100103002	MQI	WATER	l ug/L		416000	300	254	5540	42	7.5	138000	649	387	732	1240000	1620	86300	47100	0.2	701	54100	37.9	2.7	732000	104	1110	5660					
						%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%				1	vel.
RB-1	C2J100103001	MSD	WATER			86	96	96	100	95	66	98	95	92	101	87	94	96	63		66	106	95	100	96	96	86	110					= Method blank contamination. The associated method blank contains the target analyte at a reportable level
						%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%					alyte
RB-1	C2J100103001	MS	WATER			26	95	95	66	94	92	93	94	91	100	85	94	95	92		93	104	94	66	94	95	86	103					ins the target an
	-					ВЛ	ſ	_	В	ВЈ	n	В	ш	_	7		_	ſ	В		_	В	_	_	ВЈ	ſ	_	В			sted.		conta
RB-1	C2J100103001	Rinse Blank	WATER	ng/L		112	09	10 U	1.5	1.4	2	88.4	1.8	20	25 U	208	3 U	2000 U	6.4	2.7	40	49.2	5 0	10 U	744	10	50 U	8.9	relative Percent Difference not calculated.	ntrol limits.	it. Analyte not detected at Reporting Limit listed	g Limit.	i method blank
						%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	ence	oo p	at R	ortin	siated
						z	Z									Z			z)iffer	state	ected	n Re	asso
PS-9	C2J100102001	MSD	SOLID				53	85	93	06	85	91	109	88	26		86	98		96	92	92	82	6	86	98	101	104	tive Percent [= Spiked analyte recovery is outside stated control limits	nalyte not det	Result is less than Reporting Limit.	nination. The
						%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		recov	ult. A	. Res	ontan
		10	_			2	Z		•							SC		3	NC	_	~	_	~	01	7	7	7	3	and/o	alyte	t resi	result	ank c
6-Sd	C2J100102001	MS	SOLID				56	88	96	92	98	94	105	06	101		91	86		101	93	06	83	92	87	87	102	106	= Recovery and/or	= Spiked an	= Non-Detect resu	=Estimated result.	= Method bl
Sample ID	STL Sample ID	Type	Matrix	Units	Metals	Aluminum	Antimony	Arsenic	Barium	Beryllium	Cadmium	Calcium	Chromium	Cobalt	Copper	Iron	Lead	Magnesium	Manganese	Mercury	Nickel	Potassium	Selenium	Silver	Sodium	Thallium	Vanadium	Zinc	NC	Z	n	В	7

Table B-13 - Comparison of Regulatory Criteria to Laboratory Quantitation and Detection Limits

USEPA SW846 Analytical Method Chemical CAS # PaDEP Dredging Guideline Unrestricted Use Use Unrestricted Unrestrict	RL (mg/kg)	MDL (mg/kg)
Analytical Chemical CAS # Unrestricted Use Single Sample Limit Safe Fill (mg/kg) Clean Fill (mg/kg) TPH 8015B TPH (as Diesel) 120 ppm 200 ppm resid. Total of 50	RL (mg/kg)	
Method Use Limit (mg/kg) (mg/kg)		
8015B 8015B TPH (as Diesel) Total of 50		
8015B TPH (as Diesel) 120 ppm 200 ppm resid. Total of 50		
8015B TPH (as Diesel) 120 ppm 200 ppm resid. Total of 50		
1500 ppm pap ree	0.100 NS	0.039 NS
	0.010 NS	0.003 NS
F. t. J. J. C.		
т при		
8082 AROCLOR-1016 12674112 15.00		
126/4112	0.033	0.005
8082 AROCLOR 1333	0.033	0.002
8082 APOCLOB 1343 Total PCB Total PCB 0.52	0.033	0.008
8082 AROCLOR 1242 53469219 1 ppm 1 1 ppm 16.00	0.033	0.005
9.90 9.90	0.033	0.004
8082 ABOCLOB 4369 4.40	0.033	0.002
30,00	0.033	0.005
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF		
77-002 12 0.3	0.500	0.010
6020/7000 THALLIUM 7440280 14 0.6	0.100	0.003
6010B/7000 ALUMINUM 7429905	20.00 NS	1.170 NS
6010B/7001 ANTIMONY 7440360 27 3	1.00	0.385
6010B/7002 BARIUM 7440393 8,200 500	20.00	0.111
6010B/7003 BERYLLIUM 7440417 320 0.1	0.500	0.047
6010B/7004 CADMIUM 7440439 38 2	0.500	0.024
6010B/7006 CALCIUM 7440702	500.00 NS	5.572 NS
6010B/7007 CHROMIUM III 16065831 190, 000	1.00	0.107
Total Chromium 70		
6010B/7009 COBALT 7440484 24 470	5.00	0.166
6010B/7010 COPPER 7440508 4,300 100	2.50	0.113
6010B/7011 **IRON 7439896	10.00 NS	3.262 NS
6010B/7012 LEAD 7439921 45 ppm* 450 ppm (non) res 450 20	0.300	0.231
6010B/7013 MAGNESIUM 7439954	500.00 NS	2.179 NS
6010B/7014 MANGANESE 7439965 31,000 40	1.50	0.045
6010B/7016 NICKEL 7440020 650 20	4.00	0.178
6010B/7017 POTASSIUM 7440097100	500.00 NS	
6010B/7018 SELENIUM 7782492 26 6	0.500	0.275
6010B/7019 SILVER 7440224 84 40	1.000	0.065
6010B/7020 SODIUM 7440235	500.00 NS	
6010B/7021 VANADIUM 7440622 1500	5.00	0.217
6010B/7022 ZINC 7440666 7500 100	2.00	0.441
6010B/7023 MERCURY (INORGANIC) 7439976 10 2	0.100	0.009
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)		
8260B ACETONE 67641 41.00 0.003	0.020	0.005
8260B BENZENE 71432 0.13 0.05	0.005	0.002
8260B BROMODICHLOROMETHANE 75274 3.40 1	0.005	0.001
8260B BROMOFORM 75252 4.30 0.103	0.005	0.001
8260B BROMOMETHANE 74839 0.54 0.1	0.010	0.004
8260B METHYL ETHYL KETONE (2- 78933 53.00 0.005 BUTANONE)	0.020	0.001
8260B CARBON DISULFIDE 75150 160.00 0.08	0.005	0.002
8260B CARBON TETRACHLORIDE 56235 0.26 0.05	0.005	0.003
8260B CHLOROBENZENE 108907 3.40 0.3	0.005	0.001
8260B DIBROMOCHLOROMETHANE 124481 3.20	0.005	0.001

Table B-13 - Comparison of Regulatory Criteria to Laboratory Quantitation and Detection Limits

1	USEPA		1100	CICCIOII	LITTICS				
$\langle $	SW846	}		PaDEP Dre	edging Guideline				
-)	Analytical	Chemical	CAS#	Unrestricted		Safe Fill	Clean Fill	RL (mg/kg)	MDL
_	Method		ļ	Use	Limit	(mg/kg)	(mg/kg)	TYL (mg/kg)	(mg/kg)
ŀ	8260B	CHLOROETHANE	75000		Livit				
Ì	8260B	CHLOROFORM	75003			5.00		0.010	0.002
ŀ	8260B		67663			2.50	0.05	0.005	0.001
ŀ	8260B	**CHLOROMETHANE	74873			0.04	0.03	0.010	0.001
ŀ	8260B	1,1-DICHLOROETHANE	75343		~	0.65	0.05	0.005	0.002
ŀ		1,2-DICHLOROETHANE	107062			0.10	0.03	0.005	0.001
ŀ	8260B	1,1-DICHLOROETHENE	75354			0.19	0.07	0.005	0.002
ŀ	8260B	CIS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	156592			1.60	0.7	0.005	0.002
-	8260B	TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE	156605			2.30	0.06	0.005	0.002
-	8260B	1,2-DICHLOROPROPANE	78875			0.11	0.05	0.005	0.001
ŀ	8260B	1,3-DICHLOROPROPENE	542756			0.013		0.005	0.001
ļ		ETHYLBENZENE	100414			46.00	0.5	0.005	0.001
1	8260B	2-HEXANONE	591786				7	0.020 NS	0.001 NS
L		METHYLENE CHLORIDE	75092			0.08	0.02	0.005	0.002
		METHYL ISOBUTYL KETONE (4-	108101	···		2.90		0.000	0.002
-		METHYL-2-PENTANONE)						0.020	0.001
-	8260B	STYRENE	100425			24.00	1	0.005	0.001
-	8260B	1,1,1,2-TETRACHLOROETHANE	630206			0.78	0.4	0.005	0.001
-	8260B	TETRACHLOROETHENE	127184			0.43	0.05	0.005	0.002
L	8260B	TOLUENE	108883			44.00	0.2	0.005	0.002
	8260B	1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE	71556			7.20	0.1	0.005	0.002
L	8260B	1,1,2-TRICHLOROETHANE	79005			0.15	0.05	0.005	0.001
	8260B	TRICHLOROETHENE	79016		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.17	0.05	0.005	0.002
<u>. [</u>	8260B	VINYL CHLORIDE	75014			0.27	0.02	0.010	0.002
-)[8260B	XYLENES	1330207	***************************************		850.00	0.3	0.015	0.004
	8260B	MTBE	1634044			0.28	0.02	0.005	0.002
			Chlorda	ne			3.02		0.002
ľ		Chlordane		< = 20 ppb		49.00	0.02		
		10 (0) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	Chloric		36 P. S.	40.00		100	
ľ		Chloride				250			
		Semi-Volatile Or	ganic Co	mpounds (S	(VOC's)		316		
	8270C	ACENAPHTHENE	83329	(T	2700.00	3.00	0.330	0.026
t		ACENAPTHYLENE	208968			2500.00	3.00	0.330	0.020
上		ANTHRACENE	120127			350.00	7.00	0.330	0.032
ľ	********	BENZ[A]ANTHRACENE	56553			25.00	0.1	0.330	0.033
Ī		BENZO[B]FLUORANTHENE	205992			25.00	0,6	0.330	0.045
		BENZO[K]FLUORANTHENE	207089			250.00	6	0.330	0.043
	8270C	BENZO(GHI)PERYLENE	191242			180.00	3	0.330	0.029
	8270C	BENZO[A]PYRENE	50328			2.50	0.002	0.330	0.030
Γ		BIS(2-CHLOROETHOXY)METHANE	111911					0.330 NS	0.037 NS
	8270C	BIS(2-CHLOROETHYL)ETHER	111444			0.00		0.330 #	0.038 #
	8270C	BIS(2-ETHYLHEXYL)PHTHALATE	117817			130.0	0.06	0.330	0.032
	8270C	4-BROMOPHENYL PHENYL ETHER	101553					0.330 NS	0.027 NS
	8270C	CARBAZOLE	86748			0.37		0.330	0.029
L		4-CHLOROANILINE	106478			19.00		0.330	0.022
L		4-CHLORO-3-METHYLPHENOL	59507			37.00		0.330	0.028
L		2-CHLORONAPHTHALENE	91587			6200.00		0.330	0.030
L		2-CHLOROPHENOL	95578			4.40	0.4	0.330	0.057
	8270C	4-CHLOROPHENYL PHENYL ETHER	7005723					0 330 110	0.000 NO
√ŀ	92700	CHRYSENE	210010			220.00	50.00	0.330 NS	0.023 NS
)L	8270C	CHRYSENE	218019			230.00	50.00	0.330	0.032

Table B-13 - Comparison of Regulatory Criteria to Laboratory Quantitation and Detection Limits

	USEPA		una D	election	LIIII(2				
٠.	SW846		1	PaDEP Dre	dging Guideline				T
À	Analytical	Chemical	CAS#	Unrestricted		Safe Fill	Clean Fill	 	MDL
	Method		}	Use	Single Sample Limit	(mg/kg)	(mg/kg)	RL (mg/kg)	(mg/kg)
ĺ	8270C	DIBENZ[A,H]ANTHRACENE	53703						
	8270C	DIBENZOFURAN	132649		······································	2.50		0.330	0.022
	8270C	DIBUTYLPHTHALATE	84742				3	0.330 NS	0.031 NS
	8270C	**1,2-DICHLOROBENZENE	95501			1500.00		0.330	0.030
Į	8270C	1,3-DICHLOROBENZENE	541731	<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	60.00	0.7	0.330	0.046
Ĺ	8270C	1,4-DICHLOROBENZENE	106467		**	60.00		0.330	0.039
	8270C	3,3'-DICHLOROBENZIDINE	91941			10.00	0.7	0.330	0.023
	8270C	2,4-DICHLOROPHENOL	120832			8.40		1.600	0.020
Į	8270C	DIETHYLPHTHALATE	84662			1.00	0.2	0.330	0.035
L	8270C	2,4-DIMETHYLPHENOL	105679			160.00	0.3	0.330	0.030
	8270C	DIMETHYLPHTHALATE	131113			31.00		0.330	0.029
L	8270C	**4,6-DINITRO-2-METHYLPHENOL	534521				0.06	0.330 NS	0.027 NS
L	8270C	2,4-DINITROPHENOL	51285			0.04		1.600 NS	0.021 NS
		2,4-DINITROTOLUENE	121142			0.21		1.600 #	0.498 #
		2,6-DINITROTOLUENE	606202			0.05	0.0005	0.330 #	0.030
	8270C	DIOCTYLPHTHALATE	117840			1.10 4400	0.0005	0.330	0.025
L	8270C	FLUORANTHENE	206440			3300.00	40	0.330	0.029
L	8270C	FLUORENE	86737			380.00	40	0.330	0.031
	8270C	HEXACHLOROBENZENE	118741			0.96	0.01	0.330	0.029
		HEXACHLOROBUTADIENE	87683			1.20	0.01	0.330 0.330	0.027
Γ		**HEXACHLORO -	77474			91.00	0.01	0.330	0.045
L		CYCLOPENTADIENE		1		01.00	0.5	1,600	0.022
	8270C	HEXACHLOROETHANE	67721			0.56	0.01	0.330	0.022
Ĺ	8270C	INDENO[1,2,3-C,D]PYRENE	193395			25.0	0.6	0.330	0.048
)L	8270C	ISOPHORONE	78591			1.9	1	0.330	0.043
L	8270C	2-METHYLNAPHTHALENE	91576			2900.00	2	0.330	0.034
L		2-METHYLPHENOL	108394			20		0.330	0.049
L		4-METHYLPHENOL	106445			2	0.04	0.330	0.074
L	8270C	NAPHTHALENE	91203			5.00	0.2	0.330	0.034
L	8270C	2-NITROANILINE	88744			0.04		1.600 #	0.031
L	8270C	3-NITROANALINE				-		1.600 NS	0.031 NS
		4-NITROANALINE						1.600 NS	0.019 NS
L	8270C	NITROBENZENE	98953			0.79		0.330	0.041
L		2-NITROPHENOL	88755			5.90		0.330	0.045
L		4-NITROPHENOL	100027			4.20	0.05	1.600	0.023
L	8270C	N-NITROSODIPHENYLAMINE	86306			20.00	*******	0.330	0.037
L		N-NITROSODI-N-PROPYLAMINE	621647			0.0013	0.03	0.330 #	0.033 #
L		2,2'-OXYBIS(1-CHLOROPROPANE)	108601			8.00		0.330	0.054
L		PENTACHLOROPHENOL	87865			5.00	0.01	1.600	0.023
L		PHENANTHRENE	85018			10000.00	8	0.330	0.032
L		PHENOL	108952			66.00	0.02	0.330	0.036
L	8270C	PYRENE	129000			2200.00	30	0.330	0.036
L		1,2,4-TRICHLOROBENZENE	120821			28.00	0.7	0.330	0.035
L		2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOL	95954			2300.00		0.330	0.032
L	8270C	2,4,6-TRICHLOROPHENOL	88062			17.00		0.330	0.023

^{* =} TCLP Leachate lead must be less than 5.0 mg/l. The soil to groundwater pathway is 450 mg/kg and is the most stringent standard.

Unadjusted RL and MDL values, final RL and MDL values will be adjusted for moisture and dilutions NS = No Standard

^{1 =} PQLs are from PaDEP published Clean Fill Standard. Where clean fill levels are lower than the PQLs, the PQL is the standard.

^{# =} The Safe Fill Standard is below the RL provided by the laboratory.

Table B-14 - North Park Lake Volatile Organic Compound

QC and IDW Sample Results

				pie K	52	uits			
Sample ID		B-1		DF	₹-1		TRIF	B	LANK
STL Sample ID	C2J10	010	3001	C2J100	10	3002	C2J1	001	103003
Туре		RINS	E BLANK	ID	W				Blank
Matrix	WA	TE	R	WA ⁻	TEI	₹			ER
Volatile Organic Compound									
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L	5		ug/L
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L	5	_	ug/L
1,1-Dichloroethane	5		ug/L	5	U	ug/L	5		ug/L
1,1-Dichloroethene	- 5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L	5		ug/L
1,2-Dichloroethane	5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L	5		ug/L
1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L	5		ug/L
1,2-Dichloropropane	5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L		U	ug/L
2-Butanone	20	U	ug/L	20	U	ug/L	20		ug/L
2-Hexanone	20	U	ug/L	20	U	ug/L	20	U	ug/L
4-Methyl-2-pentanone	20	U	ug/L	20	U	ug/L	20		ug/L
Acetone	20	U	ug/L	13	J	ug/L	20	~~~~	ug/L
Benzene	5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L
Bromodichloromethane	5	U	ug/L		U	ug/L	5	Ū	ug/L
Bromoform	5	U	ug/L		U	ug/L	5		ug/L
Bromomethane	10	U	ug/L	10		ug/L		Ū	ug/L
Carbon disulfide	5		ug/L		Ū	ug/L		Ū	ug/L
Carbon tetrachloride	5		ug/L		U	ug/L	5		ug/L
Chlorobenzene	5		ug/L		U	ug/L		Ū	ug/L
Chloroethane	10	U	ug/L	10		ug/L	10		ug/L
Chloroform	5	כ	ug/L		U	ug/L	5		ug/L
Chloromethane	10	U	ug/L	53		ug/L		Ū	ug/L
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	5	U	ug/L	5	U	ug/L		U	ug/L
Dibromochloromethane	5	U	ug/L		Ū	ug/L		Ū	ug/L
Ethylbenzene	5		ug/L		Ū	ug/L		Ū	ug/L
Methylene chloride	5	U	ug/L	5		ug/L		Ū	ug/L
Styrene	5	U	ug/L	5	Ū	ug/L	5	Ū	ug/L
Tetrachloroethene		Ū	ug/L	5		ug/L		Ū	ug/L
Toluene		Ū	ug/L	5		ug/L	5		ug/L
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	5	U	ug/L		Ū	ug/L		Ū	ug/L
Trichloroethene	5	U	ug/L	5		ug/L	5		ug/L
Vinyl chloride	10		ug/L	10		ug/L		Ū	ug/L
Xylenes (total)		Ū	ug/L	5		ug/L	5		ug/L
	<u></u>								
Surrogate Recoveries			104	,		0,	~ 4		0/
1,2-Dichloroethane-d4	92		%	111		%	91		%
4-Bromofluorobenzene Dibromofluoromethane	98 101		%	92		%	98 98		%
Toluene-d8	95	·	%	89		%	95		%
Bold font inicates detected analyte.	. 30		70	03		/5			.,,
U - Indicates analyte was not detected.									
J - Indicates value reported is an estimated v	alue, which i	s bel	ow Repor	ting Limit for	anal	ysis.			

Table B-15 - North Park Lake Semi-Volatile Organic Compound QC and IDW Sample Results

Sample ID			DR-1		TS-	 5	TS-	5
STL Sample ID		1 1	C2J100103002	2	C2J30026		C2J3002	
Туре	Rinse Blar	nk	IDW		MS		MS	
Matrix	WATER		WATE	R	SOLI		SOL	
Semi Volatile Organic Compound	ug/L		ug/L	,				
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	9.5 U	J		U	80	%	79	%
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	9.5 U		49	U				//0
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	9.5 U	J	49	U		-		
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	9.5 U	J	49	U	75	%	73	%
2,2'-oxybis(1-Chloropropane)	9.5 U		49	U				10
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	9.5 U	J	49	U				
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	9.5 U		49	U			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
2,4-Dichlorophenol	9.5 U	J	49	U				
2,4-Dimethylphenol	9.5 U		49	U				
2,4-Dinitrophenol	48 U		240	U				
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	9.5 U		49	U	82	%	81	%
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	9.5 U		49	U				
2-Chloronaphthalene	9.5 U		49	U				
2-Chlorophenol	9.5 U		49	U	73	%	71	%
2-Methylnaphthalene	9.5 U		49	U				
2-Methylphenol	9.5 U		49	U				
2-Nitroaniline	48 U		240	U				
2-Nitrophenol	9.5 U		49	U				
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	48 U		240	U			····	
3-Nitroaniline	48 U		240	U				
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	48 U		240	U			-	
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	9.5 U		49	U				
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	9.5 U		49	U	68	%	67	%
4-Chloroaniline	9.5 U		49	U				
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	9.5 U		49	U	***************************************			
4-Methylphenol	9.5 U		49	U				
4-Nitroaniline	48 U		240	U				
4-Nitrophenol	48 U		240	U	73	%	71	%
Acenaphthene	9.5 U		49	U	80	%	78	%
Acenaphthylene	9.5 U		49	U				
Anthracene	9.5 U		49	U				
Benzo(a)anthracene	9.5 U		49	U				
Benzo(a)pyrene	9.5 U		49	U				
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	9.5 U		49	U				
Benzo(ghi)perylene	9.5 U		49	U				
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	9.5 U		49	U				
bis(2-Chloroethoxy)methane	9.5 U		49	U				

Table B-15 - North Park Lake Semi-Volatile Organic Compound QC and IDW Sample Results

Sample ID			DR-1		TS-	5	TS-	5
STL Sample ID			C2J100103002		C2J30026		C2J3002	
		Rinse Blank		·	MS		MS	
Matrix	WATER		WATE	R	SOL		SOL	
Semi Volatile Organic Compound	ug/L		ug/L				- 001	
bis(2-Chloroethyl) ether	9.5 L	J		U				
bis(2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate	4.5 J		290					
Butyl benzyl phthalate	9.5 L	J		U				
Carbazole	9.5 U	J	49	+				
Chrysene	9.5 U	J	49					
Di-n-butyl phthalate	9.5 U		49					
Di-n-octyl phthalate	9.5 U		49					
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	9.5 U		49					
Dibenzofuran	9.5 U		49					
Diethyl phthalate	9.5 U		49					
Dimethyl phthalate	9.5 U		49					
Fluoranthene	9.5 U		49					
Fluorene	9.5 U		49					
Hexachlorobenzene	9.5 U		49					
Hexachlorobutadiene	9.5 U		49					
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	48 U		240		<u> </u>			
Hexachloroethane	9.5 U		49					
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	9.5 U		49					
Isophorone	9.5 U		49					_
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	9.5 U		49		57	%	56	0/
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	9.5 U		49		57	70	56	%
Naphthalene	9.5 U		49					
Nitrobenzene	9.5 U		49		***************************************			
Pentachlorophenol	48 U		240		79	%	76	- 0/
Phenanthrene	9.5 U		49		79	70	76	%
Phenol	9.5 U		120	\cup	71	%	67	0/
Pyrene	9.5 U			7 7			67	%
yrene	9.5 0		49	<u> </u>	84	%	80	%
Surrogate Recoveries								
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	57	\Box	29		73	%	72	%
2-Fluorobiphenyl	59	_	24	*	82	%	80	%
2-Fluorophenol Nitrobenzene-d5	57 65	-	59 55		63 78	%	62 77	% %
Phenol-d5	59	-	62		67	%	66	%
Terphenyl-d14	74	_	20		81	%	78	%
Bold font inicates detected analyte.								
J - Indicates analyte was not detected. - Indicates value reported is an estimated value,	which is below R	leno:	rting Limit for	analy	sis.			
'- Indicates result is outside control limits for ana		Lepoi	ting Dillic 101	anary	310.			